

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated August 8, 2006.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Inoue et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,832,085 (hereinafter Inoue) and Okuyama et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,987,126 (hereinafter Okuyama). The Examiner rejected claims 5-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Inoue, Okuyama, and Oskouy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,791,947 (hereinafter Oskouy). The Examiner rejected claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Inoue, Okuyama, and Yanagihara et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,684,917. The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Inoue, Okuyama, Yanagihara, and Takeda, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,101,215.

The Examiner indicated the opinion that the copying of MPEG data into the data portion of a DIF block, as is claimed in claims 1-19, amounted to a format conversion, hence did not view the limitation, added in a prior amendment, of “without conversion to another format” as distinguishing over the prior art. Though the applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s claim analysis, each of independent claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 16, 17, and 18 has been amended to remove this limitation.

As amended, each of independent claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 16, 17, and 18 includes the limitation of “copying said MPEG transport stream data, in an MPEG format and including an MPEG header, into [a] data field[] of [a] DIF block.” None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses this limitation. As can be seen by FIG. 4 and columns 1-14 of Okuyama, upon which the Examiner’s rejection relies, an IEEE interface 27 transmits DVR data to a recording device, and another IEEE interface 33 transmits MPEG 2 data to the recording device, where the respective MPEG data and DVR data, though transported across the same transmission path, are not combined. Nor would a format conversion by the recording device accomplish the claimed procedure; reformatting MPEG data as DIF data, for example, would not copy the MPEG data, including the MPEG header, into the data field of a DIF block. Therefore, each of independent claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 16, 17, and 18, as well as their respective dependent

Appl. No. 09/465,415
Amdt. dated November 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 8, 2006

claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14-16, and 19, each patentably distinguish over the cited prior art because each claim includes a limitation that is not disclosed in any cited reference.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631